REMARKS

The present response is in reply to the Office Action dated December 23, 2008. Claims 72-87 are pending; claims 78-80 and 82 have been withdrawn and claims 72-77, 81, and 83-86 are under rejection. Claims 72 and 81-86 have been amended by this response. Support for the claim amendments can be found, *inter alia*, at [0022] and [0029] and Figs. 1, 2b, 5, 7-9.

Claims 72-77, 81 and 83-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karas et al. (4,867,144), which was first cited in the last Office Action. The amendments to independent claim 72 overcome the rejection, and applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Independent claim 72 has been amended to recite a method for performing a craniofacial reduction. As set forth in the application, the present invention describes a process for reducing fractures of the craniofacial skeleton (e.g., a blow to the head may cause the craniofacial bones to be fractured and some pieces may become depressed in the head cavity). Accordingly, claim 72 has been amended to recite that the method is accomplished by first positioning a supporting structure around the patient's head, where the supporting structure is designed to secure the reduction platform. The reduction platform is adjustably secured to the supporting structure so that the platform can be easily moved into position. The reduction platform has means to secure to the supporting structure. The reduction platform is located over the patient's head at a position above the surface of the patient's head. In the method, the fractured bone portion is first located, which fractured portion is adjacent a second bone portion. A fragment manipulator having a threaded, bone-engaging end portion is inserted through a bore in the reduction platform and is engaged with the fractured bone portion. A nut is threaded onto the fragment manipulator until it contacts the reduction platform and is rotated so that the fragment manipulator is drawn up through the nut to pull the fractured bone portion attached to the manipulator toward the reduction platform. The relative position of the fractured bone portion is thereby changed with respect to the adjacent, second bone portion.

Karas 144 does not teach or disclose the subject matter of claim 72 as now amended. First, Karas does not disclose a method whereby there is positioned adjacent the head of the

patient a supporting structure for adjustably securing the reduction platform. Second, Karas does not disclose that the reduction platform has means for fixation to the supporting structure. Third, Karas does not disclose adjustably securing the reduction platform to the supporting structure. Finally, Karas does not disclose locating the reduction platform above the surface of the head of the patient. Rather, Karas simply discloses the use of a bone plate that is used without a supporting structure, that does not have means for fixation to a supporting structure, that when used is not adjustably secured to a supporting structure, and when used is not located above the surface of the head of the patient.

Accordingly, the rejection of claim 72 as being anticipated by the Karas 144 patent should be withdrawn in view of amended claim 72. The dependent claims from claim 72 are allowable for these reasons as well.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests allowance for the pending claims.

Date: February 11, 2009

/David R. Bailey/
David R. Bailey
Registration No. 35,057

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439